



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,043	12/01/2000	Dan Anthony Balogh	4-4-4-18	2578
22046	7590	12/20/2005	EXAMINER	
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC. DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR 101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219 HOLMDEL, NJ 07733			LY, NGHI H	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2686

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/728,043	BALOGH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nghi H. Ly	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes et al (US 5,613,196) in view of Sonetaka (US 6,591,107).

Regarding claim 1, Regarding claim 1, Barnes teaches a method of sharing supplemental channel resources (Abstract and column 12, lines 27-41, and column 17, lines 6-16, see “*preassigned backup channel*”. Barnes’ “*backup channel*” reads on Applicant’s “*supplemental channel*”) in a system utilizing open assignment (see Abstract, column 17, lines 6-12 and see column 24, lines 62-65) and prospectively assigning channel resources are available for prospective assignment (see column 17, lines 6-16, see “*preassigned backup channel*”). Barnes’ “*preassigned*” reads on Applicant’s “*prospectively assigning*”).

Barnes does not specifically disclose open waiting states for responding to a resource request, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a data notify request indicating a request for channel resources, and prospectively assigning currently unavailable channel resources to support a future channel for a user associated with the received data notify request if the data notify request was received during an open assignment state during which the currently unavailable channel resources are available for prospective assignment.

Sonetaka teaches open waiting states (see Abstract, “*occupied*”) for responding to a resource request (see column 4, lines 43-45), the method comprising the steps of: receiving a data notify request indicating a request for channel resources (see column 4, lines 43-51), and prospectively assigning currently unavailable channel resources to support a future channel for a user associated with the received data notify request if the data notify request was received during an open assignment state during which the currently unavailable channel resources are available for prospective assignment

(Abstract, see “*assigning channel preserved in advance*”, and column 4, lines 62-65, see column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sonetaka into the system of Barnes in order to assign radio channel to traffic having a high service rank (see Sonetaka, column 1, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 2, Barnes further teaches determining whether other supplemental channel resources are available if the data notify request was not received during the open assignment state (see Abstract, see “availability”).

Regarding claim 3, Sonetaka further teaches assigning the other supplemental channel resources to the user if the other supplemental channel resources are available (see column 1, lines 54-63).

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Barnes teaches supplemental channel resources (Abstract and column 12, lines 27-41, and column 17, lines 6-16, see “*preassigned backup channel*”. Barnes’ “*backup channel*” reads on Applicant’s “*supplemental channel*”).

Barnes does not specifically disclose scheduling a next data notify request to be issued for the user in a next preferred user assignment window associated with the other channel resources, the preferred user assignment window corresponding to a time period during which a current user may be scheduled to issue a data notify request.

Sonetaka further teaches scheduling a next data notify request to be issued for the user in a next preferred user assignment window associated with the other channel

resources, the preferred user assignment window corresponding to a time period during which a current user may be scheduled to issue a data notify request (see column 4, lines 29-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sonetaka into the system of Barnes in order to assign radio channel to traffic having a high service rank (see Sonetaka, column 1, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 5, Regarding claims 4 and 6, Barnes teaches supplemental channel resources (Abstract and column 12, lines 27-41, and column 17, lines 6-16, see “*preassigned backup channel*”. Barnes’ “*backup channel*” reads on Applicant’s “*supplemental channel*”).

Barnes does not specifically disclose determining whether the currently unavailable channel resources are in an open waiting state during which the currently unavailable channel resources are not available for prospective

Sonetaka further teaches determining whether the currently unavailable channel resources are in an open waiting state during which the currently unavailable channel resources are not available for prospective assignment (see column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sonetaka into the system of Barnes in order to assign radio channel to traffic having a high service rank (see Sonetaka, column 1, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 7, Regarding claims 4 and 6, Barnes teaches supplemental channel resources (Abstract and column 12, lines 27-41, and column 17, lines 6-16, see “*preassigned backup channel*”. Barnes’ “*backup channel*” reads on Applicant’s “*supplemental channel*”).

Barnes does not specifically disclose scheduling a next data notify request for the user to be issued if the currently unavailable channel resources are not in the open waiting state.

Sonetaka teaches scheduling a next data notify request for the user to be issued if the currently unavailable channel resources are not in the open waiting state (see column 8, lines 38-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sonetaka into the system of Barnes in order to assign radio channel to traffic having a high service rank (see Sonetaka, column 1, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 8, Barnes further teaches determining whether the user is a current user of supplemental channel resources (Abstract and column 12, lines 27-41, and column 17, lines 6-16).

Regarding claim 9, Regarding claims 4 and 6, Barnes teaches supplemental channel resources (Abstract and column 12, lines 27-41, and column 17, lines 6-16, see “*preassigned backup channel*”. Barnes’ “*backup channel*” reads on Applicant’s “*supplemental channel*”).

Barnes does not specifically disclose reducing a continuation count for the user if the user is a current user and scheduling when to issue a next data notify request for the user based on the continuation count.

Sonetaka teaches reducing a continuation count for the user if the user is a current user and scheduling when to issue a next data notify request for the user based on the continuation count (see column 4, lines 43-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sonetaka into the system of Barnes in order to assign radio channel to traffic having a high service rank (see Sonetaka, column 1, lines 50-53).

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes et al (US 5,613,196) in view of Sonetaka (US 6,591,107) and further in view of Vanderspool, II et al (US 5,261,118).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Barnes and Sonetaka teaches the step of prospectively assigning the currently unavailable supplemental channel resources (see Abstract and see column 4, lines 62-65).

The combination of Barnes and Sonetaka does not specifically disclose determining if a first data rate is different from a second data rate, the first data rate being associated with the currently unavailable supplemental channel resources, the second data rate being associated with the future supplemental channel.

Vanderspool teaches determining if a first data rate is different from a second data rate, the first data rate being associated with the currently unavailable supplemental channel resources, the second data rate being associated with the future supplemental channel (see column 10, lines 44-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Vanderspool into the system of Barnes and Sonetaka in order to provide time synchronization of data transmissions generated from the transmission stations.

Response to Arguments

5. a. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

b. Applicant's arguments filed 09/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 5 of Applicant's Argument, Applicant argues that Sonetaka does not teach open waiting states for responding to a resource request as recited in the claim.

In response, Sonetaka's Abstract, discloses "assigning channel preserved in advance" and "assign radio-channel to traffic...even if radio-signal channel are all occupied by traffics". In addition, Applicant's specification page 12 lines 19-21, discloses "*The OW state corresponds to a state in which the SCH resources supporting an existing SCH are not available for prospective assignment*". Therefore, Sonetaka

does indeed teach Applicant's open waiting states) for responding to a resource request (see column 4, lines 43-45). In addition, Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above.

On pages 6 and 7 of Applicant's Argument, Applicant argues that Sonetaka's radio channels are reserved in advance but are not assigned until all the other channels are occupied or Sonetaka does not teach assigning currently unavailable channel resources and neither the reserved channels nor any other channels are being prospectively assigned when they are not currently free.

The Examiner, however, disagrees. Sonetaka does indeed teach Applicant's claimed limitation (see Abstract, "*assigning channel preserved in advance*" and "*assign radio-channel to traffic...even if radio-signal channel are all occupied by traffics*").

On page 7 of Applicant's Argument, Applicant further argues that the combination of Sonetaka and Vanderspool does not teach claim 10.

In response, the combination of Sonetaka and Vanderspool does indeed teach Applicant's claim 10. In addition, Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2686

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly

(Signature)
12/06/05

Marsha D. Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600